

maintained liaison contact with the Party leader-
11357 ship.

Q. Did there come times when an open member was withdrawn as an open member.

The Witness: Yes.

Q. What would be the purpose of that? A. The purpose of that was that members from branches were withdrawn from time to time for various reasons. One reason would be that the person was selected to be a mail drop. The address was to be used. That person was isolated from his branch, and he became known as a member at large. Or in the period of 1949 a whole number of places, I would say close to 100 such party members were withdrawn for the following reasons. There were efforts to get as many meeting places, telephone contact places, places for individual party leaders to stay for a long period of time, for a specified period of time or just for meeting another person at a specified time. So these people were all drawn out from the Party organization and were told that their function from now on would be to carry out the assignment that they were assigned to. There were people who were drawn out, who were not integrated in the Party organization who were key people in mass organizations, so to speak. For example, in the top councils of the American Jewish Congress there were a number of Communists who were not members of any branch, who maintained contact with a Party person and got guidance and consultation through that type of liaison.

Then there were trade union leaders in the Party who at a certain given period of time in 1947 already and later on more frequently, just dropped out from Party activity and maintained personal contact with Party leaders on trade union problems.

These are the various reasons why Party members were drawn out from their regular Party organization to which they were belonging and became members at large.

.

The Witness: I want to say there were also members of the New York Police Force who were members at large, and I used to collect dues from these policemen in the Communist Party, and get donations from them at the time when there was a fund drive to raise funds for the Communist Party.

By Mr. Paisley:

Q. In the summer of 1948 you were Secretary of the State Review Committee, were you? A. Yes.

11359 Q. What was the position of Emanuel Levine?

A. Emanuel Levine at that time was on the ninth floor as a security officer. This was in the summer of 1948?

Q. Yes. A. Because shortly after that he went in as circulation manager of the Daily Worker.

Q. Did he have occasion to make complaints to you? A. Yes.

Q. About a Party member being exposed? A. I recall one instance. This was in the spring of 1948, during the fund drive.

Q. You mentioned the ninth floor. The ninth floor of what? A. The ninth floor, popularly known as the headquarters of the National Committee of the Communist Party.

Q. The Daily Worker was where? A. The Daily Worker business offices were on the second floor.

Q. The same building? A. The same building.

Q. What is the address? A. 35 East 12th Street

Q. So Emanuel Levine came to you and made a complaint? A. Made a complaint that one of his members at large, who was integrated in one of his apparatuses—

.

The Witness: A member in one of his apparatuses was contacted by the open regional director of the Party for money. This person was Lenny Levinson, who was at that time the regional director of the Communist Party on the upper West Side. Levine complained that because of this now he will have to drop this person because the identity of this person, if not isolated, would lead to the others in that set-up, and complained about Lenny Levinson, that he sticks his nose into too many things that are not his affairs. He said that Lenny crossed his path once before on the West Side with people who were under the protection of Emanuel Levine, in contact with Levine.

By Mr. Paisley:

Q. What was the name of this person? A. Rogozin, R-o-g-o-z-i-n, I believe. Johnny Williamson spoke to me about it, too, after Emanuel Levine said that 11361 Johnny wanted immediate action on this, that we will not allow a situation where such sloppiness can be real, and an investigation of Lenny Levinson. Such investigation was conducted, and it was found out that Lenny Levinson was formerly an employee of the Federal Bureau of Investigation in the fingerprint department. When John Williamson found that out he immediately instructed us to see that Lenny Levinson was removed as regional director. I conveyed that instruction to George Blake. Lenny Levinson shortly after the 1948 convention was removed as divisional director and Betty Haubrecht became the regional director. A little bit later on Levine came to me complaining that while Lenny was removed, he was still on the payroll. What happened I don't know. I told George Blake. I don't know what organizational steps were taken.

Q. All this resulted from his having discovered this undercover person? A. Having contacted one person in Emanuel Levine's apparatus.

Q. Mr. Lautner, did you have any official function to perform in the Communist Party in connection with the Party's going underground? A. After the indictment of the 11 that was my main function, to prepare the New York Party organization to go underground.

Q. Who gave you the assignment? A. This 11362 assignment was given to me by Bob Thompson, State Chairman of the New York State organization.

Q. Were your activities to be confined to the New York region? A. To New York State.

Q. Just tell the Panel all about it, what you did, who worked with you, and so forth. A. When the indictments came down Bob was not available for a week or so. Finally when he came into the office a few days after that he called me in and he said he wanted to have a meeting with me and the secretariat.

Q. He was one of the individuals who had been indicted, I understand. A. Yes.

Q. He had made bail, had he? A. I beg your pardon?

Q. Had he made bail? You said he was not available. A. He wasn't arrested when the indictments came down. The others were. He was out for a while. Then he voluntarily came in, and I met him a few days after that. Then he told me he wanted to have a meeting with me and the secretariat. I asked him about the nature of the meeting, and he said, "Well, I want you to prepare a report on what steps are in effect to safeguard the Party and what security steps are in effect as of the present."

11363 Q. What experience had you had in the Party that would particularly qualify you for this work?

A. The fact that I had certain security measures in effect up to that point that I took over from J. Peters as to contacting people, as to calling meetings of section organizers, and similar measures.

Q. Were you also teaching classes at this time? A. Yes, I was teaching classes in that period of time, yes.

Q. All right, go ahead and tell us what you did. A. I called a meeting in my place, in my house, and I gave him a report of what steps were put into effect to eliminate some of the sloppiness that existed in the indiscriminate use of telephone, calling meetings by letter, calling meetings by telephone, and things of that sort. I told him that we worked out a structure in New York County where if George Blake wanted to call a meeting of section organizers, all he had to do was to get in touch with two contacts, and these two contacts in turn would get in touch with three each, that is six and 12, and in this way through three contacts, through a chain, get in touch with the section organizers and convey a message from the County leader.

Q. When you were first directed to do this work did you meet with the secretariat of the New York State Committee? A. I gave this report to the secretariat 11364 at that meeting. Besides Bob Thompson, Bill Norman and Hal Simon were present. They were the secretariat of three at that particular period. I gave this report of what measures we had taken, how we had tried to discourage the indiscriminate use of telephones, not to give Party leadership by telephone from an office, but to have personal contact, and this system of communication. Bob said, "Well, this is not the thing that we want. We need something else." Then he told us that Foster, William Z. Foster, who recently came back from Europe—he was in Europe in late 1947—that Foster in discussing repressive measures—

11365 The Witness: In discussing the possibility of the repressive measures against the Communist Party in the United States, certain organizational measures were suggested and Foster described that it was desirable to adopt the three system that was in effect in Europe, in most of the countries where the Party was underground. Bob told us that the authorities know this system. Never-

theless, it is the best devised system yet for the protection of the Party. Also Bob further went on to say that it was the experience of the Communist Parties in Europe that when these parties were driven underground there was a contraction of about 90 per cent of the Party membership in the various countries, Germany, Italy, Hungary, wherever the Communist Party was driven underground. So, Bob said, "We must base ourselves on these experiences and we must expect a similar situation that might develop here in case the Party is declared illegal." He said, "Our problem will be, therefore, to find that 10 percent of the Party membership now, while we have time, that can be integrated into an organization and will function as the Communist Party even if the Party as such is declared illegal."

He said that this 10 per cent must be established where it could be most effective in the labor movement and the trade unions and in the mass organizations where they had reasonable protection working in these mass organizations.

By Mr. Paisley:

Q. Did you decide to adopt this system of threes, which you say Thompson said Foster had suggested? A. Yes. Bob told us to work out a detailed plan how it would look, and also to designate levels in this structure.

Q. Tell the Panel now what steps you took to put it into force. If necessary, you can use the blackboard there to illustrate how it worked.

Q. Did you put the system into effect? A. Yes. By the time I was expelled from the Communist Party all levels were integrated. There were seven levels in the underground organization, and it was functioning on the principle that the initiative always comes from a higher level, and that no lower level of this structure or no lower three can at any time contact a higher level. The initiative comes

from above. That is one of the essential principles of this structure.

11367 When Bob told us to work the details out we had about three or four meetings after that. Bob pulled out after this initial meeting because he was busy with his trial. I met with Hal Simon and Bill Norman on a number of occasions where we were perfecting on paper a plan before we even would discuss it outside of this small circle. We divided up New York State into three areas. Area 1 was New York County with its trade union industrial sections and the cultural division of New York County, the cultural division that was attached to the New York State organization. Area 2 in this structure was Kings County, Queens, Nassau, whatever was in Nassau, Bronx County, and Westchester County, and the industrial sections that were in Kings County. Area No. 3 comprised the upstate part of New York State, Buffalo, Rochester, Albany-Schenectady, and the tier, Endicott, Johnson, Binghamton and that part of the state. That was area 3.

By Mr. Taylor:

Q. What do you mean by the cultural division? A. The cultural division is the division that we spoke about, an industrial form of set-up under the New York State leadership, not the New York County leadership. In the cultural division you had all those who were professionals, in radio, television, the arts and the sciences. Those people
11368 were members of the cultural division of the party. The cultural division organization was led by Dave—I don't recall the name. Lionel Berman was the organizational secretary, and I don't recall the other names.

By Mr. Paisley:

Q. Go ahead. A. Dave Gordon was the educational director of the cultural division, Lionel Berman was the organizational secretary. There was a change in positions there for a while when Dave Gordon became the organiza-

tional secretary and Dave Golden was the political head of the cultural division of the Party.

Q. Let's get back to this plan to go underground. A. I described the three areas that were divided. I wish at this time that I could visualize this structure, what it looks like.

Mr. Paisley: That is quite all right. Do you have a piece of chalk?

The Witness: May I use the blackboard?

Mr. Brown: Surely.

By Mr. Paisley:

Q. As I understand it, there were two aspects, one a vertical and one a horizontal, is that right? A. At this stage we were discussing only the vertical aspect of the structure, integration of that ten per cent that we 11369 thought would be the underground organization in case the Party was driven underground.

The Witness: The top three of the structure were known to be the state leadership of the Party. The state leadership was composed of three people, three persons, the political head, the organizational head, and the trade union mass organization head of the state leadership.

The next step was that the political head on his own initiative, but by instruction, would select three political heads, one for each area.

11373 The Witness: I would like to say that what we planned was put into effect.

Q. You said that before, didn't you, Mr. Lautner? A. Yes.

Q. In plain English? A. Yes.

Q. Just a few minutes ago? A. Right.

Q. All right, now go ahead. A. The political head of the state leadership on his own initiative was to appoint

a political leader for each one of the three regions. The organizational leader was to do the same thing, and the trade union mass organization leader of the organization was to do the same. So we had the same three leaders on an area level. How were these three to get together? By a preliminary arrangement, by giving a certain identification from the top and by setting a date and a specified time and by instructions from the top three, these three were to come together. Then they knew each other. This person only knew his three people.

Q. By this person will you identify whom you mean?

A. The political person knew his three people in the lower organization on the lower level, on the areas level. The organization person knew his three. The political person did not know this or this person. All he knew was the three persons below him. The same principle applies to others.

In case these three on the state level made a decision it was not necessary for him, the political leader, to run to each of his three people on the lower triangles, but he would by prearrangement inform any one of them in the triangle, either this one or that one or this political leader and if he chose this one then the original and the trade union chose the other one of the two. So one person by informing only one on the lower level covered all three, each on the top taking care of one area leadership. It was not necessary to duplicate or triplicate decisions down the way.

Then this level further down the third level, was known as the county level. It was just a designation. It didn't adhere to any specific county lines. That was the third level.

The next level was the regional level, and then there was the section level, and then there was the sub-section level, and then there was the basic organization of the structure, the bottom three, the unit. We had seven levels. If there were three on the top level, 9, 27, and it multiplied

by 3 that way, 81, 183, 729, altogether about 3150 or 3200 people were integrated into this structure.

We worked on these plans up until the beginning of 1949, and then we called a meeting of county leaders where we projected in a general way the plan, and then this plan was to go down to the fourth level by the middle of 1949. I was busy with another aspect of this structure while this known as the vertical structure of the Party was being built. We decided to take out of the work a former treasurer of the New York State organization of the Party by the name of Dave Leds or Dave Ameriglio, to work with Hal Simon in checking how the four levels that were established already functioned. We called a meeting of county leaders in the middle of 1949 to check whether there was a proper integration, whether the proper personnel was integrated on the four top levels. We came to a number of conclusions there. One that on the first four levels when we checked—and we checked through an envelope 11376 and colored paper method—when we checked the first four levels we came to one conclusion, that we hit the bottom of the barrel too quick, that not the proper personnel was integrated in the four top structures of this organization. We came to another conclusion, that no Negro leaders of the Party were integrated into this structure in the top four levels in New York State. We were quite alarmed and concerned about it because this was in 1949 at the highest, when a political campaign was conducted in the Party and the struggle against white chauvinism here in this phase of the work was a clear manifestation of white chauvinist practices. We felt that we were leaning backwards too much, in other words security too much at the expense of this over-all political question, the Negro question.

When this check up was made it was decided to yank out from this structure those that were not suited to be on the second, third, or fourth levels, and to replace them. How that was to be done, that was done through the top three and through those who were integrated on an area

level. I myself went upstate to Buffalo where I had a meeting with the upstate area top three, and there we had a different problem. The problem was that the structure provided for the underground organization was too big. There weren't enough people in some places, and they were scattered all over the upstate area, that could not fit into this structure, so in some places the structure went down to the fifth level, in some places it remained at the fourth level from the area level down, and some places only two levels were accomplished in smaller places like Binghamton or the outskirts of Buffalo. When these four layers were checked the integration was made. The "go" signal was given to build the structure all the way down to the seventh level.

Q. Who gave the "go" signal? A. The "go" signal was given by the secretariat. I had a discussion with one of the persons in area No. 1 and one of the persons in area No. 2. As I said before, upstate we had a special problem, and this building of the structure all the way to the seventh level proceeded. So by the time of the end of the 1949 structure was complete, we had a meeting and it was in the process of testing. The question arose that Kings County—it was protested that Dave Leds, who was a Kings County functionary, part time functionary, was taken out from Kings County with the consent of the county but they didn't realize for how long and they were demanding that Leds should go back. However, it was agreed with Hal Simon that as soon as the checking of the structure all the way down was done, Dave Leds would go back to Kings County and function in the capacity of finance secretary or what.

Q. You answered a moment ago the secretariat. 11378 Did you mean the national secretariat? A. The party secretariat, the state secretariat, who in the meantime was composed of Bill Norman, Hal Simon and George Blake. George Blake in the summer of 1949 was drawn into these discussions. We had a number of meetings at various places, at various times. If necessary, we have all that.

Q. Mr. Lautner, after the county leaders were informed about these plans were any steps taken to put the plans into operation? A. What we were involved with here was to build up this structure while the legal organization of the Party was functioning, and at this meeting in January in 1949 when we informed the county leaders that this plan was going to be put into effect and that they should inform any and all of their members in their respective counties of any questions that are raised, what is the Party doing, is the Party doing something in the face of these attacks, that they should inform these people that an organization was being put into effect that would take care of and face any eventuality. Also we made it clear that it was necessary to build a structure to safeguard the continuity of the Party, and that it was necessary to have a structure in case even if the Party is driven underground, to have an organization force that can fight its way back into legality. In a disorganized way that is practically impossible. In an organized way through this structure it would be possible to fight back in an organized fashion and possibly get back to a legal status. That was made clear at the meeting.

What happened when the first four levels were built after our meeting when we were evaluating the structure to that point, Hal Simon was designated to make a test of the first four levels. About a month later we had a meeting where Hal Simon reported that the test was put into effect and that it was satisfactory. Bill Norman made the additional statement at this meeting that we must now take steps on the question of the integration of Negro leadership into the four structures.

By Mr. Paisley:

Q. To whom were they reporting? A. To the following people who were at this meeting. The meeting was held near St. Mark's Place. I don't know the house number there, but it was a home of Lefkowitz, known in the Party

as Lefty Lefkowitz, who was a youth leader. He gave his house for an all-night meeting where this evaluation was made. Bill Norman instructed me to speak to Pettis Perry and acquaint him with what we were doing, if he was not acquainted in a general way, and sound him out on the question of integration of Negro leadership. That meeting between myself and Pettis Perry did take place, where Pettis Perry made a strong point that this is not a question of a purely organizational nature but this is a highly political problem. That week-end he was going down to the south and he said he would have opportunity to discuss the form of Party organization in the South and when he came back he would have a conference, that we would have a discussion about it and he would have definite opinions. I also sounded out "Stretch" Johnson.

Q. Is Pettis Perry a Negro? A. He was elected at the 1948 convention as an alternate member of the National Committee, a Negro leader of the Party, head of the negotiation commission of the Party. I also sounded out Howard "Stretch" Johnson in a general way what we were doing and what were his views about the integration of Negro leaders into the structure. He said from the point of your security it is a ticklish problem, but the political aspect of this problem is more important to him too than only the security aspect of it. I reported back to Bill Norman and that is where it stood on this problem at that time. "Stretch" Johnson to my surprise, we were discussing it and already building it and in the middle of 1949 the state educational director didn't even know what the Party was contemplating in the way of building a structure within the Party in preparation for going underground.

Q. What was done below the lower level? How far did you go down? A. By the time December 1949 came around it was built all the way down to the seventh level. In that meeting that I had with Hal Simon this was made known to me. Dave Ameriglio was doing the testing at that time

and the structure was completed. I am discussing only the working aspects of this structure, the integration of the threes based on certain security principles all the way down to the Seventh level. There were horizontal aspects of this structure going on simultaneously and I was more concerned because of personal responsibilities in that respect.

Q. Before we go into the horizontal aspect of it as I understand it the initiative was always from the top, is that right? A. That is right.

Q. With whom would a man on the seventh level, for instance, communicate? A. Only with the three people the additional two people around him in his or her particular triangle, and by initiative from above from the person who was on the sixth level.

Miss McHale: May I ask a question along that line, Mr. Paisley: How wide-spread was this known among the membership, the rank and file, or was it a top secret with the higher officers of the Party?

The Witness: It was known to those who were integrated. There was this problem: Some people were already integrated into a structure on some level when they were approved again by somebody else on a lower level. These people when they were integrated already were told to leave me alone, I am not interested. Cases like that were brought to my attention.

By Mr. Paisley:

Q. This vertical arrangement contemplated some 3000 members, you say? A. Yes; this is a mistake here. 81, 243, 729, and three times 729, and then three times 729 three times. It would be 3,000-some-odd members integrated into this structure, which corresponds to about 10 per cent of the integrated membership numbers that we had in 1948. We thought we had on paper about 30,000 members in New York State. Actually I don't think we had more than about 23 or 20-some-odd thousand members who were actual dues-paying members at that time.

Q. Do you know whether or not that system was put into effect in any other region than New York State? A. Yes.

Q. How do you know that? A. I know about that because in the horizontal aspects we introduced certain features pertaining the printing, for instance that were available. We took the initiative in New York State, and in 1949 there was a plenum held and Jack Kling sent some of these people down to give them samples of hand mimeograph machines that were to be integrated into these three so as far as printing was concerned they would be self-sufficient. We gave them a sample of these machines to take over to their respective states.

Q. We will get into that just a little later, Mr. Lautner. I probably misled you there. Let me ask you this question: Taking the second level where you have three triangles, how many men would the organizational man know in this vertical setup? A. Take for instance, these three over here. These three would know each other. As far as the individuals are concerned, this individual would be known by these two, by this person up on the higher level and he would know those three that he appointed on the next lower level.

Q. So the political man in the second tier— A. Would know six persons. That would be the extent of his knowledge about who are Party members.

Q. Would that be true of a man on the third level in the same position? A. The same principle prevails all the way down except the last level, the seventh level, where he or she would know only the two additional people in that triangle and the contact above who from time to time contacted that person on the seventh level.

Q. You told us about the vertical aspect of the underground system. Will you relate to the Panel the horizontal aspect? A. Simultaneously as this structure was under development, and as it was built we had the following problem on the horizontal level. First, reserve leadership on the top level, reserve leadership in case this cadre was

cut up, that there is a second and third string of leadership that would step right in and assume leadership and responsibility to carry out and to give leadership to that party.

Q. That was your problem— A. This was the responsibility of the top three, to establish one or two or, if necessary, more threes on a horizontal level as reserve leadership. They were to be isolated completely. They were to be informed from time to time what the organizational problem was. That was their assignment, to be in reserve as a reserve leadership. In the meantime they could function in the legal organization or they could function in the trade union or wherever they were functioning, but they were designated as reserve leaders in case something happened to the top three.

Also, the following aspect of the horizontal leadership was considered. First, printing. We agreed that we would stash away two complete sets of hy-power photo offset printing equipment, beginning from plate manufacturing or plate developing, chemical processing, and the printing machine itself. It was my responsibility to establish these two sets. At the time I was there one such complete unit was put into effect, was established. This unit was placed out on White Plains Road in the Bronx in a small plant where a complete unit, a complete hy-speed photo offset equipment, printing machine and all the chemicals and plate-making paraphernalia was put into effect there. It was there, and it was used from time to time. It was used for the following reason: We could have that machine and wrap it up in cellophane. If nobody touches it the dust would get around it and it would get rusty. In order that it might be in working operation on a minute's notice it had to be tested and had to be worked from time to time.

That is the kind of machine it was. It was used for various reasons which I will come to later.

Q. Before you get into the details of such matters as you have been discussing, Mr. Lautner, will you tell us generally what the groupings were in this horizontal

structure? A. We had reserve leadership, we had printing, we had communications, we had contact places, meeting places, a person in charge of that.

Q. How about finances? A. Finances, and persons to secure paper for printing, and the distribution of printed matter or printed material, a whole apparatus for that function.

Q. What did you do about providing for the need for money, for instance? Take that aspect of it. A. At the meeting where we discussed and oriented the county leaders about what the Party was contemplating doing there were two points on the agenda, a report on the fund drive on finances, and my report, a general report on preparations for going underground or preparations in the struggle for the legality of the party. In the report on finances at that particular meeting Bill Norman, who gave the report, projected a budget for 1949, \$650,000, which was to be broken down into county quotas, section quotas, and branch quotas, but the over-all state budget 11387 was \$650,000 for the whole state organization. In his report Bill Norman also emphasized that a part of the budget must be allocated for this type of work, preparations for going underground. Here is what we did on the state level. One day I was approached by Bill Norman to work up a list, to make up a list of about 20 people who in my opinion were loyal and devoted enough to the Party that they wouldn't change their loyalty for, let's say, \$20,000 or \$15,000 or that amount of money. After a week or so I prepared such a list, giving due consideration to each individual that I put on that list, and I gave him 20 names. To my surprise he called in two additional people the next day, and the two additional people were Bernie Chester, who was the treasurer of the state organization, and May Miller, who were similarly coming into this meeting with their lists which Bill Norman told them to prepare. So we had three times 20 names, out of which 60 names were exchanged. We had

60 names and we came to the conclusion, let Bill Norman have all the 60 names and let him select his own 20 names that he wants. If he wants to trust these people, each individual, with the amounts of money that he thinks they are trustworthy of, that would be his problem. We gave the list over to Bill Norman, and that is the last that I have heard of that problem.

At this finance meeting Bill in his report also 11388 indicated that it was necessary to put money away, and I know as a fact that New York County had such money because when we gave them 120 adding machines they paid with cash, and Kings County, out of the reserve money that already was laid away from the budget for preparations for going underground.

Q. What was the principal function of this underground organization to be? In other words, what were they going to do? A. The feeling was that if the Party was declared illegal there was an organized force that was supposed to fight in an organized fashion, to fight back into legality. That was the version that we gave to the county leaders. We had in mind that by projecting this organization into the Party at that time might create a situation where the Party members would feel that the Party was going underground and that the legal organization was done away with. In order to avert, in order to avoid that possibility we stressed that only in this way can we guarantee any success of a fight back into legality. Beyond that, what this organization was supposed to do once the Party was illegal, the main work that the Party under those conditions could do would be propaganda work, leaflet production, and stuff like that.

That is why on all these levels we tried to supply various forms of reproducing machinery, printing machinery, 11389 ery, and each three should be supplied with that.

Besides whatever abilities that this organization could do, what it can not do as a Communist organization, members of this organization could function in the trade

unions and mass organizations in individual capacities based on their knowledge and association within the organization and with instructions from this organization as members of that organization, not as open Communists.

Q. Did you decide on what equipment you would need and did you take any steps to acquire any of this equipment? A. Yes, sir.

Q. Will you relate that to us? A. I spoke before that we had this full set of high-speed photo offset equipment, printing equipment on the state level. The New York State organization gave the upstate area another photo offset printing machine because they were poor relations upstate. They didn't have the finance means for it. New York County area 1, New York County and the cultural division and the trade union section were supposed to set up their photo offset equipment, and in Kings County they had one already, and it was stashed away in a small cabinet shop around Williamsburg Bridge. The name of the cabinet maker who runs that shop is Harry. I don't know his other name. We had a complete unit in his establishment there.

The state unit, as I said before, was up in the 11390 Bronx on White Plains Road in a little factory.

Q. Did you yourself have occasion to see to the establishment of another one some other place? A. By 1949 I had one complete. Here was my problem. If you buy a new machine, these machines are registered. These machines rest on cement foundations. So the manufacturer has a registered number of that machine and the purchaser is known. So I had to buy the first machine, a second-hand machine in very good condition. That machine has been purchased from Bill Stencil, who was a mimeograph shop on Union Square. He does not know that the Party bought that machine from him because the person who went to purchase the machine bought it for himself, paid cash, and a truck came and the machine was hoisted on that truck and it was taken away. This person who purchased the machine was an expert on building up this unit so that it became a self-sufficient, complete printing unit.

Q. Do you know a man named Frank Shore? A. Frank Shore was the owner of that little shop out on White Plains Road where this photo offset equipment was established, and Frank Shore in his little factory also manufactured those little hand flat mimeograph machines that were purchased by the various areas so that they were distributed in the structure to each of the threes. At the time I was still there Area 2, Kings County and the 11391 related counties to that area, bought and paid for 120 machines, and they ordered an additional 1020 machines. New York County bought and paid for 120 machines, and I delivered those machines on a Saturday morning in the Jewish Labor Bazaar, Morning Freiheit-Daily Worker Truck to a place, a little laundry on the lower East Side a block off the street, where they placed these 120 machines. The person who was with me taking these machines was Bernie Taylor, the treasurer of the New York State organization, who drove the car.

Q. How do you spell that name? A. That was his party name. He is also known as Schuster.

Q. Would you describe these little machines you are speaking about to the Panel and tell us something about the cost of them, where they were made, and so forth? A. Already in 1947-48 there was a consciousness in the Party to get as many mimeograph machines and to supply Party branches and Party sections with mimeograph machines. New York County, whenever the occasion arose, gave mimeograph machines as prizes. The Bronx County did the same thing. These machines finally were stashed up in section headquarters and county offices, because they were cumbersome big things. They had the rotating drums.

Nobody wanted to keep a machine like that in his 11392 house. New York apartments are small. The clothes closets are packed. Our problem was to devise a type of mimeograph machine that could be taken apart, which could be disassembled, spread around the apartment so it doesn't look like a mimeograph machine. Such a machine was secured, a sample of one was secured,

and such machine was manufactured on White Plains Road in this little factory where I paid money for the manufacture of these machines as I got these machines from these individuals.

Q. Who made them, do you know? A. Frank Shore made these machines.

Q. How much did he charge you for them? A. I think it cost the state about \$9 per machine.

Q. Was he a Party member? A. He was a member at large. We sold these machines to the counties for \$12 apiece.

Q. Did you ever have occasion to pay him any money? A. Oh, yes.

Q. For these machines? A. Yes.

Q. I show you these three papers right here, Mr. Lautner. Will you tell the Panel just what they are? A. These are receipts for the money that I paid to him on these hand machines.

Q. Is that in his handwriting? A. That is his 11393 handwriting, and that is his signature. This first one is my handwriting but his signature, where on the purchase of the high-speed photo offset equipment I gave him \$1500 to go ahead and buy it, and I made that look like a loan to him. I signed that.

* * * * *

Q. That was Party funds, I presume, that you used? A. That was money I got from Bill Norman and from Bernie Chester upon the instructions of Bill Norman and Hal Simon, who were members of the New York State Secretariat.

Q. Does that represent all the receipts that you obtained? A. No. These are some of the receipts. I don't have all the receipts.

Q. Approximately how much money was invested in the machines? A. We had plans to make 1000 of these hand machines and pay Frank Shore \$9 per machine, to pay him about \$9,000.

11394 Q. Were you going to use that many machines?

A. At the time I left the Party we had about 600 manufactured, an additional 100 was in process of being manufactured, and 300 additional were to be manufactured later on as the requirements of the organization demanded.

Q. You were going to need that many in the New York organization? A. Yes. You can figure out that there are approximately 3000 integrated, three to a triangle, approximately a machine for each triangle. About a thousand machines were to be manufactured. Also I was instructed by Jack Kling, who was the national treasurer, and to my understanding he was involved in similar type of work on a national scale—that is why he sent me down in Cleveland—he told me to safeguard and save the dies with which this hand machine was made. This hand machine was composed of the following: There was a flat board made with a wooden frame, and on this wooden frame there was a metal plate. To this metal plate there was a little metal guide against which you could put leaves of paper, 20, 30 or as much as 50 leaves of paper. At the end of this wooden structure and this metal plate there was a metal structure, two rods with two springs on the bottom so that the inside part where one would put the padding and the stencil was flexible. If that metal part was folded down on the plate, going over it with

11395 a roller, that inside part where the padding and the stencil was would touch the paper and whatever marking was there on the stencil, whatever text was on the stencil, would be printed right onto the paper below. All you had to do was put in about 50 or so leaves of paper and then fold that thing and roll it over, take it out, and make another leaflet. It was a very neat little thing and did a very clean job.

The instructions that we gave with each machine: Each machine was packed in a cardboard box with a whole ream of stencils and with the following instructions, that this machine shall be assembled only at the time when it

is in production. Otherwise, take the wooden structure with the metal plate and make a picture frame out of it. You can use it as a picture frame or you can use it as a water plate or a plate of some kind. As far as the other part is concerned you can use the metal structure as a crocheting square. Even that could have been taken apart. You could completely disassemble this machine so that it disappeared in the apartment. Only one who would know what to look for would find that machine. This answered the problem how to have mimeograph machines in small little apartments where every inch of space counts.

Q. Did I understand you to say that when Mr. Kling told you to go out to Cleveland you understood you were to go on this same kind of work? A. That is what Jack Kling told me, that he felt that in New York these preparations were quite well advanced and I was to go to Cleveland to help out in the Midwest, to accelerate and speed up preparations to come on a par with the New York organization and the New York work.

11397 Q. Mr. Lautner, was paper a problem in that plan? A. Yes. We had the following problem to contend with: Each paper has its own chemical mark at the point of production where paper is produced. Each manufacturer has his own peculiar chemical mark. Our problem was to integrate paper from various sources, from various manufacturers if it went into the production of pamphlets, particularly on a state level, with the machines we had. The person who was put in charge of securing paper was a leading Party member in the printing industry. I think his name was Al Ross who works out in Long Island on a paper there. He was to get acquainted with a number of paper salesmen and to get accounts for these paper salesmen with unions where we had influence, like the distributive trades, if possible with UE and other similar trade unions where paper accounts could be opened with trade unions that use a lot of paper in their office work.

Also, we established with a number of printers, small printing establishments who use paper in volume, to get an additional amount of paper, \$500 worth more of paper in their stock, in their running stock, so that in case we called upon them to supply us with paper, that

11398 paper would be available for us. It was made clear that we didn't want any paper in stock to just lie dormant because paper has the peculiarity that it gathers moisture and swells up, and for printing purposes it is not good later on. You have running stocks in a printing establishment. At two places I gave \$500 to a person who had contact—this was a different phase of the same problem—who placed this money with small printers, jobbers, that they should increase their stock by that much. So that was how we met this problem of paper. It was also made clear that the only time we would use that paper and the only time we would use the high-speed photo offset equipment was where there are no possibilities whatever to do any printing for the Communist Party or under the label of the Communist Party at all. The last resort was this resort, our own resources which we had prepared.

Q. I would like to digress just a moment from the subject of the machines and paper to a couple of matters that have occurred to me in connection with your expulsion. You have told us about Kling's position at the time you were expelled. Do you know what his position in the Party now is?

The Witness: At the time we went to Cleveland
11399 he told me he was to become the state chairman of the Wisconsin Party. In fact, he told me that the reason we didn't come together to Cleveland was that he was coming in from Milwaukee where he had a meeting on Friday night with the state committee there. So he was coming from Milwaukee and I was coming from New York, and we met in Cleveland.

11402 Q. Do you know whether or not any steps were taken toward providing these hand mimeograph machines to Communists in other parts of the country? A. Yes.

Q. I direct your attention to 1949. Was there a National Committee plenary session held? A. Yes.

Q. Where? A. It was held at 35 East 12th Street in the Hank Forbes Auditorium on the third floor.

Q. And was Kling still the National Treasurer at that time? A. Mr. Kling in 1949 was the National Treasurer of the Communist Party.

Q. Did he give you any instructions in connection with this matter? A. Yes. When the plenum was over, the following day he called me up on the telephone from the ninth floor to the fifth floor, and he told me he was going to send some people down that I should demonstrate how this hand machine worked. One district organizer after another came down. I recall Ed Starr came down and I demonstrated the machine to him, and I demonstrated the machine to the district organizer who was at that

11404 time in North Carolina, Bernie Friedlander. I demonstrated that machine to Comrade Healy, who was up to the plenum from Southern California. I demonstrated that machine to a number of district organizers. Jack Kling told me to give a machine to Illinois and to Southern California, to give samples to them. I told them they were \$9 and we had an argument over that. Anyway, I gave Miss Healy and I gave Ed Starr these sample machines. To my understanding, they were to reproduce—

Q. They want to know how you knew it. A. They were to reproduce these machines in their respective organizations because it had this advantage: You would have dies made in other different places with the aid of which you could manufacture these machines, one. Two, the transportation was a little bit cumbersome. The transportation

problem, transporting machines from New York to California or from New York to Illinois. It was more 11405 advisable to build these machines in Illinois and in Southern California.

The Witness: As far as the New York dies were concerned, Jack Kling, as I said before, told me to preserve these dies in case the national office should decide on its own to make machines. We would have these dies ready and it wouldn't cost additional money.

By Mr. Paisley:

Q. Did you preserve them? A. Yes.

Q. Where were they when you left the Party? A. When I left the Party they were out at the White Plains Road factory.

Q. Were any of these machines sent to any other part of the country? A. Brooklyn purchased ten machines for Texas, and five machines were purchased by the national office and given to Bernie Friedlander, who was district organizer in North Carolina. These machines were given to him. Upstate, which was part of the New York State organization and the upstate area, I know I gave them once 36 machines and once 15 machines. About 41 machines were given to the upstate area, for which

11406 they didn't pay. I raised this question with Bill Norman that upstate did not pay for these machines, and Bill Norman said he would straighten it out with Johnny Noto, who was the Party leader and district organizer in Buffalo.

11407 Q. Go ahead and tell us what plans you people made for the distribution of these pamphlets that would be made on the machines. A. This was the printing apparatus, the people involved in this phase of the work. We had one person who was in charge of soliciting at the various places where printing material could be placed

manufactured on these machines. Such places were solicited. The person who was in charge of this phase of the work was Burl Mikelson.

Q. What was his position in the Party? A. He was section organizer of the distributive trades section, the industrial section of the Communist Party. He concentrated on drugstores and small stores, particularly drugstores where packages could be dropped, where a drug clerk was a Party member, and these packages could be picked up by Party members. These drop places 11408 were in readiness. I saw the list of names that he gave me. He gave me about 25 places. I turned these names over to Hal Simon, who was a member of the state secretariat.

By Mr. Paisley:

Q. Were there any measures taken or plans made for actually hiding out Party members and leaders?

The Witness: Yes, there were measures taken both on the national level and on the state level simultaneously, and at the same time.

By Mr. Paisley:

Q. How do you know this? A. How? Because the person who was in charge for the national leadership for this phase of the work was Andrew Remes, former state chairman of Wisconsin, who was brought in by the national office to solicit places and evaluate these places for various purposes for the national leadership, and the person who was in charge on the state level was given to me by Carl Reinstein, who at that time was Dennis' secretary, later on treasurer of the Party. Carl Reinstein introduced a fellow to me by the name of Mitch, who made a survey along similar lines soliciting addresses of available places for various purposes, hiding out for an indefinite period of time, for a definite period, and for meeting places.

11409 This person, Mitch, was soliciting these places in New York County, in Kings County, and in the Bronx through the Party organizations. In the course of 1949 I got at least 60 such places already solicited and checked and turned over to Hal Simon, a member of the state secretariat. So, simultaneously with the national office this work was being done.

Q. Under whose supervision did this Mitch work? A. He worked under my supervision. He reported to me, and he gave me the addresses. I made it possible for him to contact various county organizers or section organizers, that he should get their cooperation.

Q. Did you arrange for different types of places of hiding? A. Yes, I spoke about that, places where one could stay for an indefinite period of time, places where one could stay for a specific period of time, weeks or a month, places where you could not stay but you could have a meeting in the morning or the afternoon, where there was a housewife at home and the wife could go out and play for an hour or two and a meeting could take place. Places where there are telephones and there is always a person available to answer a telephone, as a telephone contact place. These types of places were solicited throughout the year 1949.

Q. What did you do with this list? A. This list 11410 was given over to Hal Simon, and it was to become integrated into this structure.

Q. Was this confined only to the state leadership? A. No. As I stated before, simultaneously Andy Remes was doing it for the national office, and he told me to help him and to introduce him because he was not too well known among second and third layer party leaders in New York, and when "John" comes around that they should give their full cooperation. He went under the name of John.

Q. What did you do about it? A. I informed the county organizers that if John comes around, let's give him your full cooperation because it is an important task that he is trying to carry out.

Q. Do you know how long he was around the New York area? A. He was around for three or four months in New York. That was during the summer time of 1949.

Q. Were any other steps taken for the hiding of Party leaders? Did you ever have any discussion with Bill Norman on the subject? A. That was a different phase. That was a phase of personal security, the question of identity, the question of establishing new identities. I had a number of discussions with Bill Norman and how to safeguard those Party leaders who would be in illegality and in what best way could their personal security
11411 be kept that they not be detected and that they will not be arrested. That was the discussion, about personal security. It was not hiding places.

Q. What did you agree upon? A. We agreed upon this thing, that papers don't mean a thing, paper identification. Identification papers don't mean a thing.

.

The Witness: I told Bill Norman that you can have all kinds of papers on you over here. Once they tap you on the back, they know who you are. So the problem is a different one. The problem is to go into a small community where police surveillance is not as sharp as in a big city, establish yourself an identity over there in the course of months, and in case the Party leader will go under-
11412 ground he just goes to this little community under a new name where he has already established friends and he will try to live there; if possible, to establish a little business. So that was the approach he agreed upon, not forged documents and stuff of that sort.

By Mr. Paisley:

Q. What steps were taken, if any, to safeguard the open operating leaders of the Party? In other words, you had an organization in New York which was open, I presume. You had a Party headquarters. A. Yes.

Q. You had people who were known to the authorities as the leaders of the Party. What steps were taken, if any, to safeguard the open activity of the Party. A. To safeguard the open activity of the Party office, for instance at 35 East 12th Street?

Q. That is right. A. In the course of 1949 new iron gates were put inside, a new clock system was put into the building and into operation, certain individuals were given bodyguards. I don't know if this is the thing you have in mind. In order to enable these people to function, in order to enable the offices in the building to function so that you could not break in. Are these the safeguards you 11413 have in mind?

Q. I was wondering, for instance, did you ever have any rotating system so far as personnel was concerned. A. That was a training system, a training system.

.
The Witness: This was put into effect in early 1949 while the trial was going on. The rotating system was as follows, that only a part of the operative leadership of the Party was in the building at one time. The other part of the party leadership were told that they should stay away from all contact with the Party. They had only a telephone number to contact once a day or once a week and only to ask if there is any message for this particular individual who was out on this rotating system. By the middle of 1949 this rotating system was practiced because the trial was coming towards an end and we didn't know what would happen in case they would be sentenced, whether there would be also a raid on the Party building. So it was already in practice that part of the leadership, operative leadership, of the Party on the national level, on the state level, and even section organizers were told to stay 11414 away, some of them, for a week and some of them for two weeks. I was out on the rotating system in 1949 on four different occasions. All my personal expenses

while out were paid by the Party. I was instructed by Hal Simon not to get in touch with anybody, but once a week to meet him personally because of some of the problems I had at that time in relation to this work. But others were staying away completely, just calling once a week a given number to see whether there was any message for them. If there was none, when their rotating period was over they came back into their party functions.

11422 Q. Mr. Lautner, did there come a time when you received any instructions from the national leadership of the Party regarding the establishment of radio communications for this underground apparatus which you described?

The Witness: Yes.

By Mr. Paisley:

Q. What instructions, and who gave them to you? A. During the early summer of 1949 I received a buzz in my office room that a person by the name of John 11423 wanted to see me. I told the receptionist, the switchboard operator, to let the person in. To my surprise, this John turned out to be Andrew Remes, who at that time was the state chairman of the Communist Party in Wisconsin. He told me that he would like to have a discussion with me outside of the building. We walked on to Washington Square and sat down on a bench over there, and he told me he had a number of tasks, and among others one of them was to see to it that steps will be taken in the New York State organization pertaining to radio communication in case the Party is driven underground. He suggested that the state organization should get at least two sets of high frequency radio receiving sets, and he specifically said that SX-43 Hallicrafter receiving set is the most favorable, the best and would suit our purpose

and that I should get such sets for the New York State organization.

Q. Did he tell you where he got his instructions?

The Witness: He told me that his instructions came from John Williamson. I checked with John Williamson when we got back to the building, and John Williamson said "It is all right." On the basis of that instruction I looked around and in a short time I purchased one such set.

That set was delivered to the Party building, and 11424 the set was purchased at a surplus war material and appliance place owned-managed by Lefkowitz.

By Mr. Paisley:

Q. How much did you have to pay for it? A. I paid the wholesale price for that set. That set was turned over to Hal Simon. Hal Simon then installed this set in his own home, where he was to acquaint himself with the operations of this receiving set.

Q. Where did the money come from? A. From Hal Simon.

Q. What was his position in the Party at that time? A. He was a member of the State Secretariat of the Party, labor secretary of the Party.

Q. Were there any further instructions from this man Remes? A. Yes. When I informed Bill Norman of our discussion with Andy Remes, he took me out of the building and we had a long walk where he raised other problems pertaining to communications in general.

11425 Q. Go ahead and tell what Mr. Remes and you did and what he told you. A. With Bill Norman, I told Bill Norman what we did so far. We discussed the merits and efficiencies of various methods of communication, such as letters sent through the mail, telephone communication, Western Union. Then Bill Norman raised the question about establishing a radio sending apparatus.

At this shop at Lefkowitz place, there were a lot of surplus radio sending sets that were used during the war on ships, and Hal Simon looked these sets over, and he was satisfied that there was an ample supply of these sets around there. Bill Norman said, "If necessary, we will buy a truck and set up such sending apparatus on a truck and then supply it with batteries or whatever is necessary to increase its power." Bill Norman told me to look around in that direction to get qualified help to establish such a set.

Also Bill Norman told me, "Let's make a survey in the Party to find out if we have any ham operators, radio operators, in the Party." Such survey was made, and we found up to the point that I was expelled three such people who had ham licenses from the Federal Communications Commission and were operating such sets.

11431 Q. Did you give any consideration while you
were discussing this matter and considering it to
11432 regulations of the Federal Communications Com-
mission?

The Witness: The Federal Communications Commission in our discussions at this stage were not considered.

By Mr. Paisley:

Q. What was John Williamson's position in the Party at that time? A. Labor Secretary of the National Committee and a member of the National Board and a member of the National Secretariat.

Q. Do I understand this was in the late fall of 1949, is that right? A. This was while the trial was going on in 1949, the summer of 1949.

Q. Did you have any discussions with John Williamson about this? A. Yes.

Q. Will you relate that in detail? A. I gave a report to John. One day after his trial sessions we got into
11433 his car. We went down to Eighth Avenue, around

the Twenties. We got out of the car and we walked up and down about ten blocks up and down, where I gave a report of what we had in mind about radio communications to reach outlying sections and regions of the Party in New York State. I told him what Bill Norman had in mind, and he said, "Well, the problem is a much greater one. The problem is to establish a chain of sending apparatuses so that we can reach as far as the West Coast." That was the problem that he raised with me. Also he said that in New York City proper it is not a problem. The problem is a mobile set whose power could be increased to a point so that it could reach, for instance, Albany or around Albany a similar set that could reach to Buffalo or further down and so out to the West Coast. He said, "Let's get competent advice from Party members who know about this problem and see what organizational steps can be taken after we have a plan in this direction." That was about the gist of our discussion with John Williamson at that time.

11434 Q. Mr. Lautner, what steps, if any, did you take to recruit radio operators?

The Witness: As I said before, a survey was made, and to my knowledge we found three people in the Party who were authorized to operate so-called ham radio sending sets. These people were not approached, but we knew about them. Hal Simon knew them.

Q. Did you tell Williamson that?

The Witness: I told Williamson that, and I
11435 would like to say that Williamson made a remark that while these sets are useful for a short distance, they are not reliable for the purposes that the Party would need a radio communications system. Williamson also pointed out that radio communication is used if it is

properly handled, if people are properly trained—and here is where the FCC role came in—it takes anywhere from a minute and a half to two and a half minutes to police and detect the possible location of an underground radio sending apparatus. So any communications that would go to such system, such radio system, must be done within a minute and a half, and that these sets should be mobile, they should not be stationary.

11436

By Mr. Paisley:

Q. Did you, Mr. Lautner, ever participate in any discussions concerning the budget for the Communist Party activities in New York State for the years 1948 and 1949? A. Yes.

The Witness: The budget reports of the New York State organization were brought into the Party Committee meetings, where it was projected, usually for the early spring fund drives. The budget reports came in at the beginning of the year, in 1948 and the beginning of the year 1949. To my best recollection the budget for 1948 was about a half million dollars for New York State—

11437

Q. Mr. Lautner, was any part of these budgets allocated for this underground apparatus which you described?

The Witness: Yes.

11481

Q. What position did the writer of that article have in the Communist Party of the Soviet Union at the time?

The Witness: Malenkov was a member of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union and the Secretary of the Communist Party in the Soviet Union.

Q. How did you know that he held that position?

11482 A. He was at this conference at Warsaw where the Communist Information Bureau was formed as a representative of the Central Committee of the Soviet Party.

The Witness: So was Zhdanov, as representatives of the Soviet Communist Party.

Q. How did you learn this, Mr. Lautner? A. The State Educational Department called a round table conference on this question that was held in the Hank Forbes Auditorium and the reporter at this round table conference was Jack Stachel, who was a member of the National Board of the Communist Party of the United States, where he gave a report of the National Board's estimate of what it means, of what is the implication, what does it mean for such formation whether it is the reformation of the Communist International—

11483 Q. As I understand it, this is Stachel talking.
A. Jack Stachel.

Q. What did he say about it? A. He pointed out who were the Parties that sent representatives to this Warsaw conference, what were the Parties that were represented at this conference aiming to achieve. Were they to achieve the reconstitution of the Communist International, or was this just an organization where representatives of the various Communist Parties who will affiliate to this organization, will they exchange experiences, and opinions that will benefit all those parties represented there. Stachel

pointed out that we should not read anything else into the reports about this formation of the Communist Information Bureau and as far as affiliation is concerned Stachel pointed out that formal affiliation was not necessary for the American Party at this time. He told us that the National Board already had a position and eventually that position was published in the Daily Worker and Political Affairs, that the American Party greeted the formation of the Communist Information Bureau and that same 11484 statement signed by Dennis and Foster made it clear that the American Party will not affiliate to the Communist Information Bureau.

Q. Did Stachel in this meeting refer to Malenkov? A. He referred to Malenkov, he referred to Zhdanov, and he referred to the leaders of the other Parties that were present at this conference.

11486 Q. Are you familiar with New Century Publishers? A: Yes.

Q. When you left the Party, what if any was the relationship between the Party and New Century Publishers?

A. The New Century Publishers published the official theoretical organ of the Communist Party, Political Affairs, New Century publishers published practically all the Party pamphlets and other publications, small publications.

Q. Where was it published? A. New Century Publishers did the printing at Prompt Press.

11487 Q. Did New Century Publishers have an office?

A. Yes. They had an office around 12th Street and Broadway.

Q. Do you know when the publication "The Communist" was changed to Political Affairs? A. It was around 1945.

Q. Who published Political Affairs? A. Political Affairs was published by New Century Publishers and "The Communist" was published by Worker's Library Publishers, the predecessor of New Century Publishers.

Q. Do you know who was in charge of New Century Publishers? A. The person in charge of New Century Publishers was William Weiner and the production manager was Joe Field, Joe Felschen.

Q. Did Weiner have a position in the Communist Party? A. He has his offices at New Century Publishers. In the early thirties, he was the national treasurer of the Communist Party.

Q. Was Felschen a Communist Party member? A. He came in the Party in 1933 in Section 18 when I was section organizer.

Q. What about the other employees of New Century Publishers? A. The employees? Some of them I know personally were members of the Party.

Q. Who was the editor? A. The editor of what?

Q. Of Political Affairs. A. Political Affairs? Jerome V. J. Jerome.

Q. Did he have any position in the Party? A. Jerome was the head of the Cultural Commission of the Party's National Committee.

Q. Did the Party use New Century Publishers for any other purpose than publishing Political Affairs? A. Yes. Pamphlets and small books, pamphlets of that sort.

Q. Do you know the manager of the Prompt Press? A. Yes. The manager of Prompt Press was known to me as Red Cohn.

11489 Q. How long did you know him? A. Cohn was a member in Section 18 when I was section organizer there. He lived on the Upper West Side there.

Q. Did you know him after you came back from the war? A. Before.

Q. After you came back from the war? A. Yes. He was manager of Prompt Press. Before the war, Prompt Press was there in the Party Building at 35 East Twelfth Street. When I came back after the war, they had their own establishment on Fourth Avenue near 12th or 13th Street, 12th Street, and Red Cohn was still the manager.

11490 Q. With reference to International Publishers, when you left the Party, was there any relationship between International Publishers and the Communist Party? A. The International Publishers on Fourth Avenue, headed by Trachtenberg, printed all the books and classics for the Party.

Q. What position did Trachtenberg hold in the Party, if any? A. Trachtenberg at the time I left the Party was head of the National Review Commission. For many years prior to that he was a member of the Central Committee of the Party.

11491 Q. After you came back from the war, you were in the Party about four or five years, is that right? You were in the Party about four or five years? A. Yes.

11492 Q. Will you please state, Mr. Lautner, what, if anything, was the relationship between the Communist Party and the Daily Worker in the last four or five years of your membership in the Party?

The Witness: The relationship between the Party and the Daily Worker was as follows: In the course of these five years, the Party was responsible to raise the necessary funds to cover the operations of that paper. At any and all meetings whenever there were references made to the Daily Worker, they were made in the form of "our press." As far as financing it and increasing its circulation is concerned, drives were planned in the Party, in the Party structure as such, from the lowest level, from the branch level up. There were Daily Worker and Worker Press directors. The Daily Worker was published and printed in the Party building at 35 East 12th Street where the Party headquarters were. The editor in chief, John Gates, was appointed editor in chief by the

National Committee of the Party and it was made so in a statement by Bob Thompson in 1947.

11494 Q. Do you know the name of the corporation or organization that was publishing the Daily Worker when you left the Party? A. The corporation. Freedom of the Press, Ben Davis was president of Freedom of the Press. Ben Davis was a member of the National Board of the Communist Party.

11496 Q. Do you know to what extent the ninth floor supervised the Daily Worker personnel?

11497 The Witness: The supervision is of various kinds, political and security supervision. John Gates gave me a list of all the employees of the Daily Worker in early 1949 to have a check on each individual. About a month before I went to Cleveland, he asked me to get that list back to him. The list included not only the editorial workers but also the technical staff that worked in the circulation department on the second floor. It did not include printers, linotypists or this category, just the business office and the editorial offices. The political supervision is done through Daily conferences in the morning. There is a conference room. I was in there a number of times. Exchange of opinions, and representative in this instance John Gates as chief editor and member of the National Board was one way to control political supervision of the contents or quality of the Daily Worker as such. Other supervision I don't know. At national plenums in the thirties I remember where reports were given about the political quality or newspaper stature of the Daily Worker, that type of evaluation. An evaluation on the part of the National Committee.

By Mr. Paisley:

11498 Q. Now, throughout your life in the Party, to what extent did you yourself use the Daily Worker? A. The Daily Worker to me served as a daily guide. Out of the editorials I got the Party line. This was urged upon every Party functionary and every Party member, to read the Daily Worker to know what the Party is doing and what the Party is thinking.

Q. Were you familiar with this publication known as "For a Lasting Peace, For a People's Democracy"? A. Yes.

Q. To what extent did you yourself in your Party work use that paper? A. For a Lasting Peace, et cetera, was the official organ of the Communist Information Bureau and as Party functionaries on the Fifth Floor, it was supplied to us. It was put in our boxes. It was at our disposal to read it and study it. It was supplied to us by the Party itself.

Q. Throughout your life in the Party, were there any occasions to your knowledge that when the position taken by the Daily Worker as expressed in its editorials were in opposition to the positions taken by the Soviet Union—

11499 The Witness: To my understanding the question was not the Communist Party, but whether the Daily Worker in its writings ever deviated from the position, whatever the position of the Soviet Union

11500 was. It would have been odd if that would happen. It did not happen. However, during the Browder period, when I came out of the Army, still there was a policy of Browder's policies as reflected in the Daily Worker that were later on repudiated by the Communist Party and were not in line with the position of the Soviet Union as to what was their position in the post-war period.

The Daily Worker reflected Browder's attitudes and that attitude was repudiated and the Daily Worker changed its policy to conform with the policy laid down at the reconstitution convention. Outside of that excep-

tion, I don't think ever the Daily Worker, as long as I was in the Party, took issues with any position that the Soviet Union had.

11501 Q. Did you ever see any criticism in the pages of the Daily Worker of the Soviet Union or any of the so-called people's democracies?

The Witness: No, no criticism.

Q. Would the same thing be true as to the publication known as The Communist and the publication known as Political Affairs?

The Witness: Yes.

11506 Q. I direct your attention, Mr. Lautner, to that part of your testimony dealing with your attendance at the National Training School in the early part of 1941. I believe you said that was a fulltime school. A. Yes.

Q. And you had courses on Marxism-Leninism taught by George Siskind? A. Yes.

Q. What problems in Marxism-Leninism did you study in this school? A. In the courses of Marxism-Leninism?

Q. Yes. A. It was a subject matter on which we had about ten sessions, ten full day sessions. The problems that we tackled in this course was, one, to show the effectiveness of social democracy as a leader of the working class struggles. Two, to show the thinking and writing of Lenin based on his understanding of Marxism and how he had applied Marxism to the epoch of imperialism which began about the turn of the Century. Three, how on the basis of

11507 Lenin's understanding of Marxism, Lenin fought and labored for the establishment of a Party of a new type. The problem was how capitalism in the

epoch of imperialism developed. How monopoly capitalism was growing. To show the ultimate downfall of monopoly capitalism, that it is full of inherent contradictions. We tackled as a problem in Marxism-Leninism the general crisis of capitalism in the epoch of imperialism. We studied under Marxism-Leninism the writings of Stalin, his interpretation as a student, the foremost student of Leninism. We studied his writings and Foundations of Leninism, we studied his Problems of Leninism. We studied his National Question. We studied his statements, reports and speeches on the role of the Party as a force, as a leading political party, the party of the working class. In the main these were the problems that we tackled under this heading of Marxism-Leninism.

* Q. How long did this particular course in Marxism-Leninism last? A. About two weeks. It was every-day full day for about ten sessions. These sessions were organized sessions, a class session in the morning, then they broke up into study groups, it had study group problems to solve, problems were posed, and then research in the evening to carry out assignments for next day to write papers. As we know it in the schools, home work, 11508 to bring in prepared papers, assignments that were given to each student on some of these problems. I recall a number of problems that I had to work on. One was to show the fallacy of Kautsky, his fallacy about the United States of Europe. I did research on all the arguments that Lenin used against this Kautsky fallacy, so called, that the United States of Europe is not possible, that it is not progressive, it is reactionary. So research had to be done. We had at our disposal, all the writings, collected works of Lenin, all the writings of Stalin. We had at our disposal the "United Front," all the so-called classics that pertained to this subject matter, Marxism-Leninism. By the way, I want to also say that among the major problems at that time that we tackled under the heading of Marxism-Leninism was "Strategy and Tactics" and the United Front.

Q. Did the role of the Communist Party of the United States come up for discussion in this connection? A. Yes.

Q. What were you taught to be the role of the Communist Party of the United States? A. On the basis of Marxism-Leninism, that was our primary objective in that school to establish what role has this Party to play on the basis of our understanding of Marxism-Leninism and its application to given conditions here because

11509 Marxism-Leninism was told us time and time again is not a dogma. Marxism-Leninism as a theory is

a guide to action. And on the basis of our understanding of Marxism and Leninism—here again I should go a step further—the history of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union was also a problem in this Marxism-Leninism course.

We saw how from its very beginning that the Russian Party, the working class party developed, up until the stage that it takes power in 1917 (and what are the problems once the Party is in power to cope with a whole series of economic problems, political problems, a party in power, a victorious party. So in the light of all these, we had to draw our own conclusions on the basis of our studies, what the problems of the Party of the United States are in order to achieve socialism, based on our knowledge and study of Marxism-Leninism from these classes. All the stages of development, the strategy and tactics of the Party from time to time in given times and in given circumstances, what will be the conditions that will influence tactical steps in the development of a Party line that will bring us closer to the strategic aims by—

By Mr. Paisley.

Q. What do you mean by Socialism? A. Socialism is the aim of a Party not in power to gain power through the proletarian revolution and through the dictatorship of the proletariat and to establish socialism.

11510

11512 Q. Did you also study in this course on Marxism-Leninism, taught by George Siskind, "The Communist Manifesto"?

The Witness: Yes.

By Mr. Paisley:

Q. Did you study "Foundations of Leninism"? A. Yes.

Q. "Problems of Leninism"? A. Yes.

Q. "The National Question"? A. Yes.

Q. "Strategy and Tactics"? A. Yes.

Q. You said you also studied the selected writings of Lenin? A. We had volumes of the Collected Works. We had them at our disposal for research work. We also had the popular editions, so-called Workers Library editions of the writings of Lenin and Stalin and "The Communist Manifesto."

Q. Did they include "State and Revolution"? A. Yes, pamphlets.

Q. Did it include "Imperialism, the Highest State of Capitalism"? A. Yes.

Q. Were these works used in their entirety or just parts? A. All these works in their entirety were at our disposal, and in seeking the solutions to our problems given to us as home work to prepare papers we had to do our research out of these classics, out of these books in their entirety.

Mr. Paisley: Mr. Turner, will you give me Petitioner's Exhibit 149, please?

11514 (Document placed before the witness)

By Mr. Paisley:

Q. I call your attention to pages 142 to 147 inclusive in that book which has just been handed you. By the way, what is the name of the book? Does it have a title? A. "The United Front," by Georgi Dimitrov.

Q. Did you study that book in this course? A. Yes.

11516 Q. What, if anything, Mr. Lautner, were you taught concerning the world Communist movement?

The Witness: Marxism-Leninism taught us that monopoly capitalism or imperialism was a world-wide phenomenon, therefore there is need of a world-wide organization, an organization that has ties to successfully cope with this problem and eventually bring about the downfall of monopoly capitalism and imperialism.

11517 Q. What were you taught, if anything, as to the basic objective of the world Communist movement?

A. To bring about the downfall of monopoly capitalism or imperialism, and the United States was looked upon as the leading imperialist country.

11518 Q. What was to be substituted for monopoly capitalism throughout the world? A. For monopoly capitalism—

Q. What was to be substituted for it? A. A substitute for monopoly capitalism was the establishment of socialism, a socialist economy, based on the strength of the Communist Party, that strength being hegemony over the working class, the Communist Party having allies, such as farmers, having allies among national minorities such as Negroes, the Communist Party neutralizing a large section of the middle class, and the Communist Party succeeded in forcing the government, the United States Government, which government was considered a government of monopoly capitalism, to be a type of government that can not rule with the accepted democratic methods, that it has to resort to extra-legal measures to bring about that kind of situation when the Communist Party could take over, that the head of the working class could take over the political structure in the United States and take over the whole economy of the United States.

Q. In what category was the United States Government placed in these teachings? A. As the Government of the leading imperialist country.

11519 Q. Up to the time you left the Party were any of those doctrines or teachings repudiated in the Party, to your knowledge?

The Witness: Marxism-Leninism as such was never repudiated in the Party. During the Browder period what happened, the deviations from true Marxism-Leninism, the effort on the part of Browder to revise Marxism-Leninism was condemned, and Browder was expelled because of these efforts on his part.

By Mr. Paisley:

Q. I mean after the reconstitution of the Party on a Marxism-Leninism basis, were these objectives ever repudiated to your knowledge? A. No.

Q. Were you taught what role the Communist Party of the United States would play in the event of an armed conflict between the Soviet Union and the United States?

The Witness: In the study of Marxism-Leninism on the problem of imperialism this question came up, and we studied the question of just wars and unjust wars, we studied strategy and tactics.

11520 The Witness: In the school I came there to study and work. That was my assignment. On the basis of the material that was given to me, on the basis of the instructions in the form of lectures that were given to me, I had to come to certain conclusions. These conclusions were put in the form of papers. I had to report, and my report was accepted. No exception was taken by the instructor to it.

The Witness: On this particular question my conclusion was that in the case of a war between an imperialist country and the socialist country, as Communist leaders and as Communists we would support the socialist country against the imperialist country. Specifically, in case of a war between imperialist and socialist countries, between the United States and the Soviet Union, I would support the Soviet Union against the United States. That was my conclusion and it was not repudiated or rejected, 11521 on the basis of my knowledge and study of Marxism-Leninism.

11524 Q. Let me ask you, Mr. Lautner, were those pages, the 167 and 168, from the "History of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union," referred to in this course that you took? A. Yes.

Q. By your instructor? A. Yes.

Q. I show you from Petitioner's Exhibit 343, being "Strategy and Tactics of the Proletarian Revolution," put out by the International Publishers. I direct your attention to pages 94 and 95 and 96, and I will ask you if 11525 that portion of this document was used as a textbook in this course. A. Yes.

Q. In taking the course taught in that class by Sam Carr, how long did that course take? A. We studied The History of the CPSU. The instructor of that subject matter was Sam Carr. We had five sessions, one week.

Q. Did you use the entire book or only parts of it? A. The entire book.

Q. Did you have any supplementary material? A. Supplementary material, we went back to the Collected Works of Lenin, we went back to Stalin's "Foundations of Leninism," to "Problems of Leninism," "The National Question," to "Communist Manifesto," and all materials pertaining to Marxism-Leninism, because, as we learned, the history of the CPSU was the application of Marxism-Leninism from the birth of that Russian working class

party to the point of taking power, the practical application of Marxist-Leninist policies by the Russian Communist Party, how it achieved its aims and its objectives. Therefore, as we studied the chronological history of that growth and development of that Party, we always used as source material the classics, the collected works and writings by Stalin, the Communist Manifesto and all the other material that we had.

11526 Q. Mr. Lautner, during the period from the reconstitution of the Party until your expulsion in January 1950, did you do any teaching yourself? A. Yes.

Q. Will you relate to the Panel the extent of your teaching? A. In 1947 I was teaching in about four or five classes, full time classes organized by the Communist Party organized by New York County and the New York State Educational Department. At that particular time these classes were organized to accelerate the struggle for improving the ideology of the membership of the Communist Party, to enable a larger section of the Communist Party, lower functionaries, to be equipped in the struggle against revisionism, and to better acquaint them with Marxism-Leninism. Such classes were organized, and I taught in about three or four of these classes in the year 1947.

Q. Where were the classes held? A. These were party classes, party functionaries, but the classes were held in Jefferson School. One class was held in the Roosevelt Building on 14th Street and Broadway, on Union Square.

Q. Did you ever have a class on 35th East Twelfth Street? A. One class at 35th East Twelfth Street, 11527 which was an evening class. Yes, another class I was teaching in was at 350 East 81st Street, composed of Bakers, members of the Party.

Q. In 1947 where did you hold classes? A. In Jefferson School and in the Roosevelt Building on Union Square and also in the Party Building at 35th East Twelfth Street.

Q. Approximately how many students did you teach?

A. The average number of students in these classes was around 25, 20 or 25.

Q. What was your teaching experience in 1948? A. I had a class out in Brooklyn. I don't know whether it was in 1948 or 1949. In 1948 it could be in the spring that I taught one or two classes.

Q. What subjects did you teach? A. My subjects were Party organization, Marxism-Leninism, and political economy.

Q. What textbooks, if any, did you use?

11528 THE WITNESS: What texts did we use in these classes? As far as the instructor is concerned, I had all my previous knowledge about source material out of the classics. I want to say this in relation to these classes: these classes were short-term, full-time classes lasting anywhere from a week to two weeks and no longer, if they were full daytime schools. If they were evening classes—some of them were—then once a week for nine weeks. So as far as my subject matters were concerned on each subject matter I didn't have more than two sessions. What can you give in two sessions to a class on a subject matter?

THE WITNESS: So my problem was to give as many keys as possible to the student, where to look for, where to find material pertaining to that subject matter. After I gave a general picture of the subject matter, after I acquainted them with one subject matter, then we gave reading material and urged these students to do further study. Now that we had equipped them with the general picture on the subject and told them where the source material was, we

11529 urged them from then on that either they should study individually or they should form groups around themselves or they should try to establish classes once a week on a branch level. The time limit didn't allow us to go into a thorough study of each of these subject mat-

ters. However, the source material, all the classics in form of pamphlets were given to them and was available to them. We had it there at the classes. We gave them home work on it. We had maybe two sessions on the subject matter. It was a short term school and not as thorough as a national training school would be.

By MR. PAISLEY:

Q. Were there other teachers besides yourself? A. Yes. There were six or seven subject matters handled with each class, and as I said, I taught political economy in some and Party organization, democratic centralism, with special emphasis on imperialism and the general classes of capitalism.

Q. Did you teach in substance what had been taught you in the national training school? A. In substance, yes.

Q. Where did you receive these various assignments to teach or lecture? A. From the New York County school commission and from the New York State School Commission.

Q. Who assigned you the subject matter that you 11530 were to deal with? A. The curriculum for these classes was worked out by the school commissions, and I want to say that the instructors had at their disposal a library on the fifth floor at the offices of the New York State Educational Department of the Communist Party.

Q. I show you a document which has been marked for identification Petitioner's Exhibit 369. Do you recognize that? A. Yes.

11531 A. This is a curriculum for the six-day summer school. It indicates here that in 1947 seven classes were organized by New York County. There is a bibliography of pamphlets here.

Q. Were the students in these classes— A. These were given to the students.

Q. Were the students in the classes which you taught given this sort of document? A. Yes.

Q. Would you say this is representative or otherwise? A. This is the material that was worked up by the New York County Educational Department, and Ben Seminowsky was then in charge of the schools that summer. He was school director of all these classes.

Q. Is this the type of course which you taught? Did you teach in this type of summer training school? A. Yes. Imperialism, the Party theory and organization, strategy and tactics, general crisis, impending crisis.

MR. PAISLEY: We offer the document in evidence minus the marks on there.

THE WITNESS: All these subject matters, from the "Introduction" down to "Economic Outlook and Tasks of the Party based on Plenary Reports," comes under the 11532 heading of Marxism-Leninism.

Q. I now hand you what has been marked Petitioner's Exhibit No. 370 for identification, Mr. Lautner. Have you ever seen that document? A. Yes.

(Document produced and marked for identification Petitioner's Exhibit 370.)

By MR. PAISLEY:

Q. Was any use made of it made in the party? A. Yes.

Q. Tell the Panel what use was made of it? A. This outline helped the instructors at Party classes in preparing the subject matter in the course that they taught. The outline was prepared by the National Education Commission. The New York Education Department reproduced this outline and it was available for all Party functionaries and instructors in classes. We had it in New York State education department, the office of the school commission.

Q. Isn't there a document known as the "Program of the Communist International"?

THE WITNESS: Yes.

By MR. PAISLEY:

11534 Q. Also a document known as the Zhdanov Report?

A. The Zhdanov Report, yes.

Q. They are documents contained in the Communist literature, right? A. Yes.

Q. The point I am asking you, Mr. Lautner, to your knowledge was the "Program of the Communist International" used in the classes in 1947, '48, and '49.

11535 A. In these classes?

Q. Yes. A. It was referred to. It was not used. It was referred to as reference material.

Q. Why would you be referring to that as late as '47, '48, and '49?

THE WITNESS: Because the program of the C. I. lays down the strategic aims of the Communist Parties.

By MR. PAISLEY:

Q. Did the Communist Party maintain any library facilities, or any headquarters where the students could get this Marxist-Leninist material? A. Marxist-Leninist material was available in the Jefferson library. It was available in book stores, where it was purchasable at 15 or 20 cents a pamphlet, at 35 East Twelfth Street or at the Jefferson School bookstore. To these classes the school commissions brought these pamphlets to them.

Q. What was that 35 East Twelfth Street? A. That was the headquarters of the Communist Party.

Q. Who was the head of the Communist Party School Commission? A. The person in charge of training national

cadres was Pop Mindell and later on George Siskind.

11536 Q. Who was in charge of the offices there at 35th Twelfth Street? A. The offices at 35 East Twelfth Street? What offices were at 35th East Twelfth Street?

Q. Do I understand that the Communist Party School Commission had space in that building? A. Yes. In the New York State organization the head of the school commission was Alberto Morrow. During 1947-48 in New York County the educational director was Theodore Bassett, and then Monsieur Seminowsky was the school director of these classes.

Q. Were you ever in this headquarters building at 35th East Twelfth Street? A. My office was right next to the Educational Department where the school commission had its library, right next door to me?

Q. Was that where Alberto Morrow had its office? A. Yes.

Q. What was available to the students there? A. That library was for the use of instructors and those functionaries who were doing educational work.

Q. What was available to you instructors there in that place? A. All the classics, all the material, all material pertaining to any of the subject matters that were taught in these schools. This school commission supplied all these materials and texts for the instructors to enable them to carry out their functions as instructors.

Q. Is that where the outlines such as you have before you there were prepared? A. Yes. This outline was mimeographed by the New York State organization. The outline that you have there was prepared by the National Educational Commission, the National School Commission.

Q. I show you Government's Exhibit 142, being a document called "Why Communism?" by M. J. Olgin. Are you familiar with that work? A. Yes.

Q. What is the extent of your familiarity with it? A. Away back in 1934-35, while I was section organizer—

I am not exact about the year—we already had “Why Communism?” in West Virginia. It was a pamphlet to popularize the aims and objectives of the Communist Party in plain, popular language.

Q. To what extent was it distributed throughout the Party? A. We were selling it in the Party. We had 11538 it in our literature departments in the Party organization.

Q. Who was M. J. Olgin, if you know? A. M. J. Olgin was the editor of the Morning Freiheit.

MR. PAISLEY: Give me Exhibit 335, please.

By MR. PAISLEY:

Q. I show you a pamphlet marked Petitioner's Exhibit 335, being a document entitled “Mastering Bolshevism,” by Joseph Stalin, published by the New Century Publishers. Are you familiar with that? A. Yes. We were selling it in the Party organization. I sold myself a lot of these in West Virginia.

MR. ABT: What exhibit number is that?

MR. PAISLEY: 335.

MR. MARCANTONIO: When and where did he say he was selling these?

THE WITNESS: West Virginia.

MR. MARCANTONIO: When?

THE WITNESS: 1939, '40, '38.

By MR. PAISLEY:

Q. Have you yourself read it? A. Yes, and in my capacity as a Party functionary. I urged others to read it.

Q. Did you study it in the national training school? A. Yes.

Q. Was it still in use in the teaching of Marxism-Leninism when you left the Party? A. I don't know. I wouldn't know.

Q. Did you ever hear it— A. I saw it around. It was available. It was in the library. It could have been sold in

the bookstore. I have no recollection of its being in use in 1949. I have no recollection of that.

11547 Q. Do you know, Mr. Lautner, the extent to which this outline was used? A. After the reconstitution of the Communist Party in 1945 an educational campaign began in the Party to re-educate the Party membership on the true, Marxist-Leninist line and to expose and ferret out revisionism and the National Education Commission, a sub-committee of the National Education Department of the Communist Party, prepared this outline to serve as a guide in this re-education program. This guide was re-titled, re-graphed, reprinted in the bigger districts, and to the smaller districts, the National Education Department supplied these outlines to the instructors. So it was widely used throughout the country wherever the Party was functioning.

11548 Q. Mr. Lautner, did you use "The United Front" material, that is, Dimitrov's "The United Front" in any of the courses which you taught as late as 1948? A. Yes.

Q. I am referring, Mr. Lautner, to Exhibit 149, "The United Front," by Georgi Dimitrov, which you had before you yesterday. Did you use that as late as 1948? A. Yes.

Q. For the most part these were speeches made back in 1935, weren't they, approximately? A. At the Seventh World Congress of the Communist International.

11549 Q. Why would you be using that material as late as 1948?

THE WITNESS: The United Front tactics of the Communist Party were part of the subject matter of Marxism-Leninism, and in class we tried to convey the idea that the Seventh World Congress decisions pertaining to the United Front tactics and Dimitrov's report in no way eliminated or

negated the decisions of the Sixth World Congress but implemented the decisions of the Sixth World Congress in a way to enable the Party to develop a wider base on specific issues. Before the Seventh World Congress we had United Fronts that were based on a narrow concept popularly known as United Front from Below, United Fronts on specific issues, but were elements that were ready and willing to work on specific issues with the Communist movement. In the main it was an effort to increase and to advance the influence of the Communist Parties. This policy, based on the strategy and tactics of the Sixth World Congress, was a failure of the Party in Germany to make headway, the defeat suffered by the German Party, based on the strategy and tactics and the program of the Sixth World Congress, the failure in China, the failure to build the Red International Trade Union movement, the failure to gain a way or win a way to working classes, the organized section of the working classes from the influence of social democracy, with the result that reaction gained power in a number of countries. Hitler came to power in Germany. The Seventh World Congress devised a new tactical approach in order to achieve the main strategic objectives by developing a program of United Front from below and from above, and also the program of people's fronts and coalitions around a specific issue in the struggle against fascism and in the struggle against war, because fascism was the main danger of war at that time.

This policy of the Seventh World Congress was already in the making at the time Litvinov was in the League of Nations as a representative of the Soviet Union. He labored to develop that kind of United Front, first on relations between countries, the non-aggression pacts. On this specific issue in the struggle against fascism and the danger of war Litvinov tried to get a definition, what is an aggressor, who is an aggressor in the League of Nations, and once that kind of definition was accepted there, on the question of having a definition of who is an aggressor, on that question

to sign non-aggression pacts and mutual aid pacts against fascism and war.

11551 The Seventh World Congress, Dimitrov's report there is that link in the whole chain of problems, with which link you can bring that chain and advance the strategic aims of the World-wide Communist movement.

So The United Front is not a repudiation of the basic strategic aims of the Communist movement, but as step that will bring closer the realization of that strategic aim. That is my understanding of The United Front, and that is the way we tried to apply The United Front in this country over here.

Q. Did you teach how this tactical approach which you have described was to be applied to the Communist movement in this country? A. Yes. We showed in our class that the United Front in the thirties was around the question of war and fascism. It was a limited program and not the full program of the Communist Party. After 1945 there came a re-evaluation of the world situation. Now

11552 the problem was to find that link in the chain again with which a new coalition could be developed on a united front basis, on a minimum program, on a partial program of the Communist International, with which coalition we could go forward to a new milestone, to a new point and gain new adherents to the Communist movement, and when we reached that milestone there would be a new situation, a new realignment of forces, and we would find that new link with which we could go forward again. This link after the second world war was the struggle for peace. The question of peace was the new link. At the reconstitution convention Foster in his report already indicated the direction in which the Party will travel in this postwar period, and Zhdanov's report later on precisely sets the two world camps and the main issue in the coming period, the issue of peace. That is the new link today around which the Party develops its activities to broaden out and to bring about an alignment

on the basis on which it can extend its influence and exert its influence among a broader section of the population of this country.

11553 Q. Does Marxism-Leninism as you in turn taught it admit strategic changes in Party policy from time to time?

THE WITNESS: No strategic changes. Those are basic Marxist-Leninist principles. Only tactical applications, tactical changes in order to further, to bring closer the realization of the strategic aims. Those tactical changes did occur and will take place.

Q. Is this Dimitroff The United Front program an example of tactical change? A. That is right.

11555 Q. To what extent, Mr. Lautner, are you familiar with a document that is in evidence here as Exhibit 145 entitled "The Communist Party, a Manual of Organization," by J. Peters? I show you the photostat which is in evidence.

(Document placed before the witness.)

THE WITNESS: In the early thirties we sold this pamphlet in the Party. We had a literature department in New York in my section and we sold it to Party members to acquaint them with Party organization. At that time it was a very useful and a very handy little pamphlet. Later on this document was withdrawn from circulation.

Q. About when? A. It was about 1940.

Q. Do you know why it was withdrawn?

11556 THE WITNESS: It was thrown out of circulation.

Q. Did you ever have occasion to refer to this book in connection with the courses that you taught? A. Yes. As

I said before, it was a handy book on Party organization particularly, and on Party structure, Party organization, and it was good reference material even in 1949.

Q. Did you know J. Peters personally? A. Yes.

Q. He is the man you succeeded when you took over the review commission in New York? A. Yes.

Q. Do you know when he went back to Hungary?

THE WITNESS: In 1949 the latter part of May or the early part of June—I don't know the exact date.

11557 By MR. PAISLEY:

Q. Did the Party show him any recognition when he left this country?

A. The National Secretariat gave a small intimate banquet for him on Fourth Street and Second Avenue in a restaurant that has little side dining rooms. There were about 20 people present.

Q. Were you present? A. Yes.

Q. Can you tell the Panel who else was present? A. John Williamson was there. Gus Hall was there. Jack Stachel was there. Stretch Johnson was there. Betty Gannett was there. May Miller was there. That is about it.

11558 Q. Mr. Lautner, will you give the Panel briefly a synopsis of the activities of J. Peters as you knew them in the Communist Party from the time you first met him until the time he left and went back to Hungary?

11559 THE WITNESS: I knew Joe Peters or Steve Miller or Alexander or Goldberg even before I joined the Party. I knew him personally. I met Peters at 258 East 81st Street. At that time he was the National Secretary of the Hungarian Bureau.

11560 Q. Give Mr. Abt the time. You gave him the place. You are at the beginning now. Give him the time and place. A. In 1927 and 1928 in New York. He was a member of the Editorial Board of the Hungarian Daily Communist Paper at that time. My first work with Peters was in 1930, when I went to the National Training School organized by the National Hungarian Bureau of the Communist Party. In this school he taught political economy; and he was my instructor there.

Q. Did he have any official position in the Party? A. He did. He was business manager of the Daily Worker. That was printed at Union Square at that time. He was a member of the Hungarian National Bureau.

When I became section organizer in New York, at that time Peters was already a member of the National Committee of the Organization Department. In that capacity he came to my section, section 18, on a number of times and he lectured there to Party members. In 1936 when I went to West Virginia—

11561 THE WITNESS: In 1935 and 1934 J. Peters approached me a number of times and spoke to me that wherever possible I should try to get for him American citizenship papers, or birth certificates. On two occasions I did. I asked him what it was for. He told me that it was easy to obtain American passports on the basis of such papers.

11562 Q. Do you recall any other activity that he had or was engaged in when he was in the National Organization Department? A. When he was in the National Organization Department at that time I did not know what he was engaged in, but in 1949 in a conversation with him I found out what he was involved in the 1930's.

Q. You can tell what he said?

11564 THE WITNESS: Peters did say that he was in charge in the thirties of the Washington underground party. There were two parties in Washington, D. C., one functioning openly, legally as the Communist Party in any other city would, and one party that was in the government apparatus, and he as a member of the National Organization Commission had charge of this apparatus in Washington.

.

THE WITNESS: This discussion took place on a little farm near Rieglesville, Pennsylvania, in 1949, where I had Peters there on instructions of the Party to keep him out of sight when the authorities were looking for him.

.

11566 Q. Do you recall whether or not John Williamson made a speech at that farewell banquet for Peters?

A. Yes.

Q. Did he at that time say anything about Peters? A. Yes. John Williamson spoke in the name of the National Committee at this little gathering. It was a farewell speech from the National Committee to J. Peters. In his speech Mr. Williamson said that J. Peters was one of the most valuable organizers that the National Committee of the Party had, and in a way we are sorry to see him leave the country, but John said that they felt sure that J. Peters will make his contribution no matter where he will work as a Party leader.

Q. Did Peters have anything to do with the conventions?

.

THE WITNESS: I think I brought out in my testimony that in the thirties Peters was security officer at conventions, checking in delegates and seeing that security measures were maintained at national conventions and national plenums of the Party.

11567

By MR. PAISLEY:

Q. When you came back from the war what was Peters' position in the Party? A. When he came back from the war I found Peters in New York County in the capacity of executive secretary.

Q. Did he have any part in the Party after it was reorganized? A. After the reorganization in 1945 he became a functionary for New York State and was head of the State Review Commission at the time I came and took his place.

Q. You relieved him approximately when? A. The summer of 1947.

11568 Q. Will you tell us what he did? A. He didn't appear at the Party offices any more. He stayed in my apartment for about a month and a half. Then he left my apartment. He went upstate, where about a week or ten days later in Peekskill he was picked up by the Federal authorities. He was released on bail, on bond, and he didn't come around the Party offices.

THE WITNESS: In the spring of 1948 John Williamson told me to find places where Peters can stay and to take care of Peters' security. I found a place for Peters through an intermediary, through another person, out in the Bronx. Peters stayed in this place for about six or seven weeks. The place belonged to Paul A. Hirsch. He was in communication only with myself, and in the following way:

11569 He sent me a telephone number. This telephone number was in the neighborhood in a candy store where he stayed. It was a pay station, a public pay telephone. I was supposed to call him once a week every Thursday afternoon, sharp at 4:30, at this telephone number. I didn't know where the place was, I didn't know where the telephone number was until later. I was supposed to ring that phone number and when it rang twice, to hang up. Then dial the number again and in this way warn him that the

call was for him and he was sitting there waiting for that call once a week. In our conversation at this particular time he had messages for his wife, and if I had some messages from his wife I gave these messages to him. There was no party discussion or no party business discussed between us.

He was in this place up to the day of the national convention, the second day of the national convention, which was held at Riverside Plaza. John Williamson came to me again with Peters' wife, that Peters wants to move again, to find him another place.

11585 Q. Have you taught and been taught the meaning of democratic centralism? A. Yes.

Q. Will you tell briefly just what you were taught and what you taught that it meant?

THE WITNESS: Democratic centralism as a concept in the organization is clearly defined in a number of Party documents, Party classics. It pertains to rules and regulations by which the Communist Party governs itself. It is based on a democratic form of organization with a centralized organizational form, a monolithic organization with democratic processes within the organization. Democratic centralism calls for elective bodies from the highest committees all the way down to the lowest organization in which committees are elected. Democratic centralism allows discussion and debate before elections when issues and policies are opened up for debate and discussion. Democratic centralism allows that these discussions culminate in decisions.

The decisions made by the majority are binding on
11586 the minority in the organization, whether they agree or disagree with it. Once debate is closed and voted upon, the minority must carry out the will of the majority, whether it agrees or disagrees with it. If the minority insists, or if those who disagree with the policies insist on carrying on further debate, under the rules of democratic centralism that is a disruptive activity subject to Party decisions. Democratic centralism also embodies the nature

of the structure of the Communist Party organization. As I said before, democratic centralism is defined in a number of the classics, like the "History of the CPSU," the Program of the C. I., and even elaborated on in articles by Party leaders. I recall John Williamson had an article on Party organization and democratic centralism was also touched on in that article, somewhere around 1946, I think.

Q. To what extent, according to your observation, were these principles followed after the reconstitution of the Party? A. These principles in general were adhered to.

Q. Were they in effect when you left the Party? A. Yes.

11587 MISS McHALE: If the minority, hypothetically, persists in their point of view in the democratic settlement of problems, what happened?

THE WITNESS: They will be branded as factionalists and anti-Party elements who do not abide to the principles of democratic centralism of the Party and to be against the principles of democratic centralism.

Q. And would that result in disciplinary action? A. Definitely. There are ample examples in the 1930's in the Russian Party and in the American Party, too, who disagreed with the Party policies, aired their opinions and they found themselves outside the ranks of the Party. I think I mentioned in my testimony, for instance, Wischnak, who was business manager of the Daily Worker, during the Hitler-Stalin Pact period. He disagreed with the Party policies at that time. He was expelled from the Party. There was Casey, who was city editor of the Daily Worker at that time and he was also expelled from the Party. Max Bedacht, who had political differences with the Party, was also expelled, a former member of the Central Committee, and general secretary of the International Workers Order. He was removed from that organization and he was expelled. Francis Franklin, who after the reconstitution of the Party disagreed with certain policies, was expelled as a disruptive

element, violating the principles of democratic centralism. There are numerous examples like that.

11588 By MR. PAISLEY:

Q. Would Browder be an example of it? A. Browder is also an example, because Browder had his own political line and he didn't agree with the policies of the reconstituted Communist Party and eventually about a year later after the reconstitution of the Communist Party in 1945 he was expelled from the Communist Party.

11589 Q. I read from page 198 of the "History of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union," and I want to ask you a question:

"The Sixth Congress adopted new Party rules. These rules provided that all Party organizations shall be built on the principle of democratic centralism. This meant (1) that all directing bodies of the Party from top to bottom shall be elective."

How did that work in practice in selection? A. In a convention of the Communist Party a presiding committee is elected that rules the convention before the new incoming national committee is elected. As far as my experience is concerned, I was on this presiding committee of the 1940 National Convention. This convention took place at St. Nicholas Palace, and the presiding committee met in a small room in the back of the balcony. At the first session of this presiding committee Browder came in with a preferred list of who will be on the new National Committee, who will be proposed by the presiding committee for the incoming National Committee. He left one name off. The person whose name was left off was Clarence Hathaway, who was at that time the editor-in-chief of the Daily Worker. He explained to the presiding committee that there are well-founded reasons why Hathaway shall not be
11590 elected to the Central Committee or the National Committee. He didn't elaborate. That list was pre-

sented to the convention. Prior to presentation to the convention, various delegations, big states by themselves, smaller states grouped together, assembled and went over this list which was supposed to be presented to the whole convention by the presiding committee, and delegations that way first voted on that list. When the presiding committee brought this list of nominees to the full convention they already came in with the comment that most or all of the state delegations had already voted upon these, therefore this is practically the unanimous wish and will of the convention delegation as a whole, this list of proposals that the presiding committee was bringing in. However, the floor is open for additional nominations.

Before the whole convention would vote on the candidates, state delegations or groups of state delegations vote again on the proposals, and then it is brought back into the convention and finally the convention puts its approval on the incoming National or Central Committee.

• • • • •
11591 Q. Did you ever know of an instance when a full slate was rejected? A. Oh, no.

Q. Now I call your attention to the third paragraph on that same page, quote: "That there shall be strict Party discipline and subordination of the minority to the

11592 majority."

You have already explained what that meant to the Panel, and you have given certain instances where this discipline was applied.

The fourth paragraph reads: "That all decisions of higher bodies shall be absolutely binding on lower bodies and on all Party members."

I believe you said that up to the point of decision there can be discussion, but after that no discussion, is that right?

A. That is right, on policy questions. All policy questions emanate from the governing body of the Party, and if the Governing body, the National Committee, initiates further

discussion on any policy, then discussion is allowed. Otherwise, not.

11594 Q. Did you know Gerhard Eisler as a Communist International representative?

11595 MR. PAISLEY: It is already in evidence not only through this witness but through others what this man Eisler was.

11597 Q. Did you observe any activities on the part of Gerhard Eisler after 1945 in Communist Party Affairs and if so, what did you observe? A. The New York State Party organization organized a meeting under the auspices of the New York State Educational Department.

This meeting was held in the Hotel Diplomat. The 11598 hall was rented by the organization, May Miller, the Assistant Secretary for this meeting. At this meeting, Bob Thompson, the State Chairman of the New York Party, spoke, and Eisler also was one of the speakers at this meeting, where he spoke about the situation in Germany and the problems of the German Communist Party in East Germany and the problems of the Communist Party in West Germany. That was the topic of his discussion, and this was definitely a party affair.

There was another occasion. I mentioned the fact that an affair was given in a smorgasbord place on Broadway and 55th Street, a sub-basement like hall where Eisler was one of the speakers, with Eugene Dennis and other speakers there. This affair was under the auspices of the Civil Rights Congress with which the Party worked in very close relationship.

I saw him in the Party building once. I don't know what business he was transacting there. Outside of that, I didn't observe anything about Eisler.

11601 Q. Mr. Lautner, based upon your experiences in the Party, what you taught and what you in turn taught, and your conversations and contacts with the leaders of the Party in the United States, how did you yourself regard Eisler in so far as authority in the Party is concerned after 1945?

.

11602 THE WITNESS: Eisler was a leading Communist functionary whose opinions were highly authorized opinions. Whether he was the representative of the CI after 1945 or representing anybody outside of the U. S. Party, I don't know, but his opinions and his authority was respected by everyone. The fact that meetings were held for him, the fact that among high Party leaders I never heard anything against Eisler's stature as an international leader of the Communist movement.

By MR. PAISLEY:

Q. Who did you regard as the leaders of the World Communist movement?

.

THE WITNESS: The leader of the World Communist movement is the General Secretary of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, Joseph Stalin. Z

.

11603 Q. Did you have any conversation with Jack Stachel or were you present when Jack Stachel discussed the Zhdanov report?

MR. ABT: I object, leading.

11604 MR. BROWN: Overruled.

THE WITNESS: I think I have already testified that we had a round table conference where the report was given by Jack Stachel on the board's evaluation and opinions and possible decisions pertaining to the formation of the Communist Information Bureau and the Political estimate of Zhdanov in his report. In his report he indicated the political tasks.

By MR. PAISLEY:

Q. Where was this meeting, Mr. Lautner?

11605 THE WITNESS: It was held in the Hank-Forbes Auditorium.

Q. In the Hank-Forbes Auditorium, 35 East 12th Street, New York City? A. Yes.

Q. When? A. When the Communist Information Bureau was formed in 1947.

Q. What did Stachel say about this report in so far as it might affect the American Party?

Q. What did he say? A. He agreed with Zhdanov's report, and he warned the Party functionaries not to read into the report that which is not there, not to misinterpret that report and not to misinterpret the proposals that Zhdanov had in his report based on his political evaluation at that time, because in the discussion there were questions raised,

is this is a reformation of the Communist International again, when will we affiliate, when will the American Party affiliate, and similar questions. I remember the section organizer of the fur industry, Abe Staub, in his remarks very enthusiastically stated, "Well, it is about time that such an international organization is formed again." In his report while Stachel tried to eliminate all this speculation about the information Bureau, he pointed out that Zhdanov's report only reaffirms the line and the policy of the American Party when the Communist Party was reconstituted in 1945, that the American Party under Foster's leadership already in 1945 foresaw the changed political situation after the second world war and adopted its policies already away back in 1945 that conformed the report of Zhdanov.

MR. MARCANTONIO: Do you mean "conformed" or "confirmed"?

THE WITNESS: Confirmed by.

Q. Did anybody else speak about it at that meeting?

A. The meeting was held under the auspices of the New York State Educational Department, and Alberto Morrow was the Chairman of that meeting.

Q. What did he say? A. He proposed as Chair-
11607 man of the meeting, after the discussion, a plan, an educational plan to acquaint the Party membership as a whole with the Zhdanov report. He proposed an educational outline on the basis of which discussions would be held in all sections and branches of the Party on the Zhdanov report.

Q. I show you Petitioner's Exhibit 344, being an exhibit from Political Affairs entitled "The Resolution of the Information Bureau Concerning the Situation in the C.P. of Yugoslavia." Did you ever read that article? A. Yes.

Q. Did you ever conduct any lectures on the dispute
11608 between the Communist Party of the Soviet Union and the Communist Party of Yugoslavia? A. Yes, I lectured in the Hungarian Workers Hall on Westchester Avenue in the Bronx, the IWO Hungarian Hall.

Q. How did you happen to do that? A. I was invited there by a Party organization, by the Party branch to lecture on Titoism.

Q. When was that? A. In 1949, September, and in 1949 either the end of October or the beginning of November I was directed by the State Educational Department about two months before my expulsion to give a lecture to a section membership in the Bronx, Sofia Naciamento's section, on Titoism, just about a month and a half or two months before my expulsion. These were the two occasions where I lectured on Titoism in two meetings.

Q. Did you have occasion to use that document that you have in your hand? A. There were a number of documents, the charges by the Information Bureau against the Yugoslavia Party, there were statements by the Party leaders about the Yugoslav situation, there was an outline on Tito-

ism that was used as a guide, and this outline was prepared by the State Educational Department, and other material.

Q. In substance what did you state in your lecture about this situation over there?

11609 Mr. ABT: Objection.

Mr. BROWN: Overruled.

THE WITNESS: That the Yugoslav Party broke with the principles of Marxism-Leninism, that the Yugoslav Party didn't adhere to democratic centralism, that the Yugoslav Party had no policies separate and apart from those of the united front in Yugoslavia, therefore the Yugoslav Party was not a vanguard party, that Tito and his leadership was a bureaucratic leadership, that Yugoslavia eventually and the Yugoslav Party and its leadership eventually will find itself as the enemy of the Soviet Union. At that particular time the Yugoslav Party challenged the role of the Soviet Union as the leader or the pro-democratic, anti-imperialist war camp as we understood this camp on the basis of Zhdanov's report and on the basis of Party policies.

By Mr. PAISLEY:

Q. To what extent, Mr. Lautner, did the Party leaders publicize this dispute between the Yugoslav Communists and the Russian Communists?

THE WITNESS: There were articles in Political Affairs, there were articles in the Daily Worker. As I said, there was an outline made. There was a discussion in the Party on Titoism.

11610 By Mr. PAISLEY:

Q. Why were the Communist Party members in the United States interested in that subject?

THE WITNESS: Because anything that affects the leading role that the Soviet Union plays in the anti-imperialist

camp, anything that affects or challenges that leading role is a grave concern of any Communist Party, the U. S. Party and the party is based on the proletarian internationalism. The lessons of the Yugoslav Party, what were the mistakes, what were the problems of the Yugoslav Party were a concern of the U. S. Party. Furthermore, coming closer, the Party as such was concerned very much how it would affect this break between the Soviet Union and Yugoslavia, how it would affect that section of the Party membership that was Yugoslav, how it would affect those party members who are Yugoslav in origin. I remember we had this problem in the Yugoslav Workers Home, how to bring about a policy where a Party member will not fight Party member over that. In spite of that, a number of them sided with Tito. These are the factors that raised a lot of concern in our Party about this dispute between the Soviet Union and Tito.

11628 Q. Mr. Lantner, based on your experience in the Communist Party, on your study of the program and policy of the Communist Party, both in Party schools you attended and those you taught, on your experience with the practical working of the Communist Party, and on your experience as an official of the Communist Party, will you tell the Panel where primary allegiance of the Communist Party members in the United States 11629 lies, if you know?

THE WITNESS: As a Party functionary, based on my understanding of Marxism-Leninism, the primary allegiance of a member of the Communist Party lies in the defense of the Soviet Union.

11633 Q. Could nonmembers of the Party attend a national plenum?

THE WITNESS: To my way of understanding, at no time can anybody attend the national plenum unless that person is invited by the Party leadership. And I attended national committee plenums from '36 on, up until 1941, and I never knew of a single instance where non-Party people were in the national committee plenums.

11648 Q. Mr. Lautner, do you have before you there a copy of the Constitution as amended in 1948?

A. Yes.

Q. I direct your attention to so much of the preamble as reads as follows: "The Communist Party of the United States is a political party of the American working class, basing itself upon the principles of scientific socialism, Marxism-Leninism."

Based upon your experience in the Party as you have detailed it to this Panel, will you state what the phrase "Basing itself upon the principles of scientific socialism, Marxism-Leninism" meant to you?

THE WITNESS: Marxism-Leninism meant to me the policy and line of the Communist Party, as I testified in this hearing what my understanding of Marxism-Leninism was.

By MR. PAISLEY:

Q. Now I direct your attention to the next paragraph of that preamble, so much of it as reads: "The Communist Party upholds the achievements of American democracy and defends the United States Constitution and its Bill of Rights against its reactionary enemies who would
11649 destroy democracy and popular liberties."

THE WITNESS: On the basis of my understanding of Marxism-Leninism, this paragraph is in contradiction to the basic principles of Marxism-Leninism.

By MR. PAISLEY:

Q. Could you reconcile the two? A. No.

11666 Q. Mr. Lautner, what significance was attached, if any, to greetings of this type sent to Stalin, General Secretary of the Communist Party of Soviet Russia by the Party membership in the United States?

11667 THE WITNESS: First, it was a registration of the fact that Stalin, General Secretary of the Russian Communist Party, was 70 years old, that the American Party was aware of that fact, and it was a reaffirmation, such greeting was a reaffirmation of the American Party to the loyalty and the acknowledgment of Stalin's leadership of the World-wide Communist movement. That in my opinion is the significance of this telegram.

By MR. PAISLEY:

Q. Did you yourself attach that significance to this telegram? A. Yes.

11671 Q. Let me ask you some questions now, Mr. Lautner, which deal with that subject. How many party leaders were expelled when Browder was expelled? A. From the immediate national leadership the other person who was expelled was Sam Darcy.

Q. Would you tell us how many members of the Central Committee or the National Committee or the National Board, whatever they called it at the time, who were on the Board when Browder was in the Party, leader of the Party, remained on the committee or Board when he left and Foster took over? A. With the exception of three closest co-workers of Browder, namely, Roy Hudson, James Ford and Bob Minor, all the others remained in the national leadership.

Q. After Foster took over what was the attitude of the membership, as you observed it, toward the leaders who had gone along with Browder and who remained with Foster?

THE WITNESS: Immediately there was some manifestation of dissatisfaction on the part of members in the Party at the state convention already in 1945, at the New York State Convention, that the leadership, those that did remain around Foster, did not sufficiently evaluate their role, 11672 the role that they played in Browder's revisionist policies. So in the 1945 state convention a number of these leaders had to resort to all kinds of tactics over there not to allow that convention to run out of the hands of the leadership: Gil Green, for instance—

THE WITNESS: Gil Green refused to accept responsibility for Browder's revisionist policies. Bob Minor refused to accept responsibility; Charlie Krumbein, Roy Hudson. These were the Party leaders who spoke at that state convention. Shortly after that convention, a number of groups appeared in various parts of New York City who attacked the Party leadership as tainted with Browderism. These groups had names like the New Committee For Publication, a waterfront group named Fore and Aft, a group in 11673 the Bronx known as the P.R. group, the Paul Robeson group, the Francis Franklin group, various groups in New York City and particularly on the West Coast. The heads of these groups were expelled from the Party. That is what occurred in that particular period, and our problem in the Party was to seek out, ferret out all those elements, the anti-leadership attitude in the Party.

11713 Q. Will you tell us what was the main Party line which the Party emphasized? A. In 1949 the main line of the Party was based on the postwar evaluation of the world relationship of forces as laid down in the 1945 convention, in the reports and the decisions of the Commu-